

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of the above-identified application in view of the present amendment is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 5-6 and 11-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Woodle (US 5,199,518). This rejection is respectfully traversed in view of the following comments. According to the office action, Woodle discloses "a check template 4 suitable for being inserted in a housing as in elements 18 and 20, said template being equipped with force measurement means 40 which are capable of making simultaneous measurements." The office action misinterprets the teaching of Woodle and misidentifies the elements disclosed. Woodle is directed to an improved shear load cell design for use in fixed position weighing applications. The element referred to by item 4 is not a check template but an "elongate deformable member." See Woodle, Col. 3., Line 50. Items 18 and 20 are not a housing, but a "base support" and a "load receiving member" respectively. See Woodle, Col. 3, Line 59-60. Item 40 is a "strain gauge" located within a chamber 32, both of which are enclosed in the elongate deformable member 4. See Woodle, Col. 4 Line 20-30. All of the items cited in the office application are individual elements which combine to make up a single force measurement means, a shear load cell.

In contrast, independent claim 1 is directed to a process for checking the preloads applied on a nuclear fuel assembly by use of a check template having a series of force measurement means. While this process contemplates the use of such force measuring means disclosed in Woodle, it is not limited to such means, and such means is only one element of the invention. Woodle does not disclose the use of a template designed to check preloads of multiple clamps utilized in the transport of nuclear fissionable material, nor does it disclose the location of the measurement means allowing for simultaneous measurement of multiple different loads. Furthermore, Woodle is not directed to the same field of invention as the present application, nor is any reference to the use of shear load cells disclosed in Woodle in the nuclear area. Accordingly, because Woodle does not disclose each and every element set forth in claims 1, Woodle does not anticipate claim 1. For the same reason, Woodle fails to anticipate independent claim 7. Since dependent

Appl. No. 09/992,608
Amdt. dated January 8, 2004
Reply to Office action of October 9, 2003

claims 5-6 and 11-12 are dependent on claims 1 and 7 respectively, and incorporate all elements of the independent claims, Woodle fails to anticipate the dependent claims as well.


The Office Action rejects claims 2-3 and 8-9 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable under Woodle in view of Kabushiki et al. (EP 0176173A2). Kabushiki discloses the use of "processing means, which incorporates measurement processing software." This combined with Woodle is insufficient to make the invention disclosed in claims 2-3 and 8-9 unpatentable due to the failure of Woodle to disclose all of the elements of independent claims 1 and 7, upon which claims 2-3 and 8-9 are dependent for the reasons stated above. There is no indication in either Woodle or Kabushiki that the combination of a load cell and processing means may be used to create a reusable check template for transportation of nuclear fissionable material. Since there is no indication that the two references may be combined in the manner of the current application, the claimed invention is not obvious.

The Office Action rejects claims 4 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Woodle in view of Rylatt (EP 0192138A2). Rylatt discloses the utilization of display means to display data and results. For the same reasons as stated above, the combination of Rylatt and Woodle do not disclose every element of the claimed invention, and therefore does not combine to make the claimed invention obvious.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the above-identified application is in condition for allowance and allowance for the above-identified application is respectfully requested.

If there are any fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. 34132.

Respectfully submitted,
PEARNE & GORDON LLP

By: 
Ronald M. Kachmarik, Reg. No. 35412

1801 East 9th Street
Suite 1200
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108
(216) 579-1700

January 8, 2004